



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA TO MY ESSAY ON "THE ANTI-KARAITE WRITINGS OF SAADIAH GAON"

(*J. Q. R.*, X, 238-76).

In general, cf. Steinschneider, *Arab. Liter. d. Juden*, pp. 50-1 and 65 (no. 10-13), also *ibid.*, p. 339; my *Zur jüd.-arab. Litter.*, pp. 42-3, and Bacher, *Jewish Encycl.*, X, p. 582, as well as the passages quoted there. In particular, the following must also be added:

P. 242, l. 3 from bottom. Saadiah's work against 'Anân was preserved longer than I originally assumed, for it is mentioned in a list of books at the end of the twelfth century. See *R. É. J.*, XLV, 192, No. 2, and the passages quoted there. Cf. also *supra*, No. 32, and Hirschfeld, *J. Q. R.*, XIX, 137.

P. 244, l. 23 seq. The conclusion of the כתאב אלתמיין has been found in the Geniza, and edited by Hirschfeld (*J. Q. R.*, XVI, 102-5)¹. We learn from it that the whole work consisted perhaps of eight sections (see p. 103, l. 18: . . . ושרח אלבאב אלה אלדי הו מערפה אליום אלי אלמתכר פי אלגולת), and that the penultimate seventh section (the conclusion of which is extant in this fragment) dealt with the problem of ממהרת השבת, whilst in the last the question about the two days' observance of festivals (except the Day of Atonement) in the Diaspora is discussed. This last section, which has been preserved in its entirety, occupies altogether two printed pages, and if we were to conclude from this with regard to the other sections, the כתאב אלתמיין must have been small in compass. But it is also possible that the work became split up into several parts (מקאלאח), and that we have before us only the seventh

¹ The fragment edited by Harkavy (*J. Q. R.*, XIII, 656, 657) is probably rather a part of Saadiah's polemical work against Ibn Saqaweihi, see above, No. 2.

and eighth sections of the last part¹. We know, as a matter of fact, that this work must have dealt with other subjects besides the calendar and the festivals (see my essay, p. 252).

We can enter only very briefly here into the contents of this fragment. In the seventh section it is shown, in the first place, that one and the same word (in our case שבת) in two neighbouring verses, or even in one and the same verse, can very well have two different meanings (hence, in our case, festival-day and week); and secondly, that the Karaites are wrong in deducing an argument for their own interpretation from the non-mention of a fixed date for the Feast of Weeks in the Bible. Then the opinion of a יהודה אלסכנדראני is advanced, that just as the harvest of wheat is fifty days distant from that of barley, so is that of the new wine from that of wheat, which thus falls at the end of Tammuz, and that a similar interval divides the harvest of oil from that of the new wine, so that on the 20th of Elul an oil offering had to be brought. Saadiah adds that the author had arguments in support of this (ואלרליל) (לה עלי וילך). That Philo is meant by this Judah the Alexandrian, as Hirschfeld supposes, is possible; these recent discoveries have shown that his works (in an oriental translation) were known in the ninth and tenth centuries in the East, and that he is also quoted, for example, by Qirgisâni as אלסכנדראני (see all the details in my essay, "Philon dans l'ancienne littérature judéo-arabe," in *R. É. J.*, L, 10-31).—In the last or eighth section it is also stated that it is a tradition handed down by the prophets that outside Palestine two days were observed instead of one; and it is then shown that no offence is thus intended against Deut. xiii. 1, for we do not read here: "Whatsoever I *write* unto you . . . ye shall not add thereto, nor diminish from it," but "Whatsoever I *command* you," and that which is handed down by tradition must be regarded as having been commanded just as well as that which is written (p. 103, l. 9

¹ This would become a certainty if the אלקסאה אלמלי mentioned in the next note, were really taken from the *Tamjiz*.

from bottom: פאלתמסת אלמקרא לעלי אן אנדה ינאקצהם בקול לא : . . . תוסף עליו ולא [MS. ולם] תנרע ממנו פתב'נת אול אלפסוק פאדא לים פיה את כל הדבר אשר אנכי כותב לכם ואנמא הו מצוה אתכם ווגרת (אלמנקול ענר אלנטר צווי כאלמכתוב). A principle is here expressed, of the range of which Saadiah himself was perhaps not conscious.

The fragment edited by Schechter (*Saadyana*, No. IX) must also belong to the *Kitab al-tamjiz*¹. In this fragment Saadiah adduces various passages in *Rosh ha-Shanah* as a support for his theory of the great age of the calculation of the calendar, e. g. from Mishna, I, 9, which shows that often witnesses arrived after the lapse of a whole night and a whole day, so that their declaration could not be of influence any more on the fixing of the new month. The object of the observation, therefore, was only to support the calculation (see *Saadyana*, p. 33, l. 1 : פהרה דלאיל ביינה . . . ואצחה אן טלבתהם ללקמר ואשעאלהם וארסאלהם אנמא הו אלביאן [לביאן read] אלהך וצחה אלדלאיל אלדי כאנ[ו] יעטוהא פי חחקיק אלהסאב), a well-known favourite hypothesis of Saadiah. The earlier Karaites, on the other hand, forged a weapon against the Fayyumite out of the data in *Rosh ha-Shanah*, I-II.

P. 245, n. 3. The passage from Moses b. Ezra is now known in the Arabic original, and here also we read: כחאב אלחמייז פ' רדה עלי בן סאקויה, see *supra*, vol. XVIII, p. 214, n. 3.

P. 252, l. 22 seq. On the כחאב אלר' עלי אבן סאקויה (so read line 24 instead of סקויה), of which several fragments of the Arabic original have likewise now been discovered, see *supra*, No. 2. On the passage cited by Mebasser respecting the controversy between R. Meir and the sages, see also *Zf.H.B.*, IV, 21 (where in n. 3 instead of *J. Q. R.*, X, 852, read 252).

¹ As I have observed subsequently, there is here a gap between leaf 2 and 3 of the MS. Natan b. Isaac al-Siqili seems to have compiled a work for the support of tradition in general and that of the great age of the Tbbur in particular, and for this object to have included the first chapter (אלמקאזה אלאויל) of the כחאב אלחמייז in his work or compilation (my *Schechter's Saadyana*, p. 16, s. v. Natan, is therefore to be corrected).

P. 254, l. 19 seq. This polemical work of Saadiah is mentioned in a list of books from the end of the twelfth century as כתאב אלר"י עלי מתחאמל, and in another of uncertain date as אלר"י עלי אלמתחמל. In both places, therefore, the mysterious word היום is missing (see my *Saadyana*, p. 23, no. 24). The passage from Nissim's מגלת ספר is really taken from the anonymous ספר החיים, and is again printed in Jellinek's קונטרס תרי"ג, p. 46 (cf. also his קונטרס הרמב"ם, first edition, p. 29, and Steinschneider, l.c., p. 65, n. 13). The quotations in Jehuda b. Barzilai's *Jesira* commentary originate perhaps rather from the polemical work against Ibn Sâqaweihi, see *supra*, vol. XVIII, p. 214, n. 7.

P. 255, l. 27 seq. On Ben Zuta, see *supra*, No. 1.

P. 256, l. 4 from bottom. Verbal examples of Saadiah's anti-Karaite Polemic in his commentary on the Pentateuch have now been supplied by Harkavy (directed against 'Anân, see הגרן, VI, pp. 38-40), and by Hirschfeld. The latter has printed from the Geniza two fragments: on Exod. xxxv. 3, and on Lev. xi. 11-21 (*J. Q. R.*, XVIII, 600 seq.; XIX, 136 seq.). In the first fragment, which contains an extensive polemic on תבערו לא, the following passage is especially interesting (p. 607, l. 7): ומנהם מן תעלק עלינא בטריק אלקיאם פאתנה פי נזאח : שתי פאלמקדם אולא אבטאל אלקיאם פי אלשראיע אלסמעיה ודלך במא ררדה בה עלי מרעייה פי אלכתאב אלדי אלפת לה (p. 600, n. 3) sees here the title of a book composed by Saadiah against the application of Analogy in traditional laws, identifies it with an elsewhere cited כתאב אלקיאם עלי, would here amend אלקיאם to אלקיאם אלסמעיה (and also apparently עלי to פי), and would insert אבטאל. But all that Saadiah says is that a Karaite, in order to establish the prohibition (Exod. xxxv. 3) according to Karaite views, had relied on the method of Analogy, but that in a work which he had written against this Karaite (probably 'Anân) he had opposed the application of this method in traditional laws. There is thus no reference here to a special work against the method of Analogy.

Anyhow, it follows from this passage that it has been wrongly ascribed to Jefet, and therefore my own conclusion (*J. Q. R.*, XVIII, 229) must be corrected. In the fragment on Leviticus, Saadiah is throughout controverting 'Anân, as Hirschfeld rightly says. Saadiah does not name him, but indicates him as בעין אלמחרותין (fol. 1^{vo}, l. 16; fol. 4^{vo}, l. 14), הוא אלרגל (fol. 2^{ro}, l. 15; *ibid.*^{vo}, l. 3; fol. 5^{ro}, l. 17), and also הוא אלמברע (fol. 4^{vo}, l. 18). All the opinions here opposed are from other sources known to be 'Anân's. Thus besides the prohibition against eating fish which one of another religion has caught (see the proof by Hirschfeld, XIX, 138), there are also the following prohibitions: (1) to touch dead fish and birds; see his ספר המצות, ed. Harkavy, p. 66; (2) to eat dead fish, see *Z. f. H. B.*, IV, p. 74, and above, vol. XVIII, p. 218; (3) to eat hens, see *J. Q. R.*, XIX, 73 (where the words of Saadiah entirely agree with the foregoing); and (4) to eat any birds except pigeons, with reference to Gen. viii. 20, see ספר המצות, p. 67.

P. 257, l. 19. Besides in the commentary on the Pentateuch, Saadiah also disputes with the Karaites in the commentary on Proverbs: for the passages see Heller, *R. É. J.*, XXXVII, 229-30 (the passage on xxx. 10-17 must also be added, which Saadiah likewise refers to the opponents of tradition, who "calumniate the servants," i. e. the prophets, and those who follow them, before "their Lord," i. e. God, inasmuch as they characterize their tradition as falsehood. Verse 10 is especially directed against these calumniators).

Ibid., l. 2 from bottom. That Saadiah with the קום ממן בליהוריה aims at the Karaites was doubted by Horovitz (*Die Psychologie des Saadia*, Breslau, 1898, pp. 69-70) and Schreiner (*Z. f. H. B.*, III, 90), but without justification; see *ibid.*, p. 176, n. 22.

P. 259, l. 3. In his commentary on the thirteen rules of R. Ishmael perhaps Saadiah also followed, however, an anti-Karaite tendency; cf. *R. É. J.*, XLVII, 136.

Ibid., l. 8. Cf. my *Zur jüd.-arab. Litter.*, p. 42, where

I conjectured, *inter alia*, that a passage from this work is quoted in the fragment *Saadyana*, ed. Schechter, no. XVI. We here find that the persons with whom cohabitation is subject to limitations are to be divided into seven ascending degrees (p. 44, l. 17: קאל רבינו סעדיה גאון מחס[י]ה: 17: 1) harlots; (2) those despoiled of virginity; (3) relatives (twenty-eight in number, twenty according to scripture, eight according to tradition); (4) married women; (5) women in menstruation; (6) heathen women; and (7) sodomites¹. Similarly Hirschfeld edited a Geniza fragment (*J. Q. R.*, XVII, 713 seq.) and rightly proved that it belongs to Saadiah's work on "forbidden marriages." Here allusion is actually made to the "heretics" (אלכוארנ), who stand in opposition to "us, the entire body of Rabbanites" (נחן זמיע אלרבונין) (p. 717, ll. 15, 26). There ought, therefore, to be no doubt any longer about the existence of this work of the Gaon.

Ibid., l. 23. A כתאב חזעיל is also mentioned in a book-list of the end of the twelfth century; it is probably Saadiah's work of the same name. See *J. Q. R.*, XIII, 328; *R. É. J.*, XL, 87. But the Geniza fragment edited by Hirschfeld (*J. Q. R.*, XVII, 721 seq.) belongs not to the כתאב חזעיל of Saadiah, but consists of a portion of his 'Amanât, cf. *ibid.*, XVIII, 146.

P. 260, l. 7 seq. On the כתאב אלחארין see also my *Schechter's Saadyana*, p. 23, no. 23, and Bacher, *R. É. J.*, XLIX, 298.

P. 261, l. 2 from bottom. Read MS. Heb. e 45 (Cat. Bodl., vol. II, No. 2787¹).

Ibid., n. 2. On the סעדיה רב נקור quoted by Rashi on Ps. xlv. 10, cf. also Bacher, *Die Anfänge d. hebr. Grammatik*, p. 60, n. 2, and Steinschneider, *Vorlesungen über d. Kunde hebr. Handschriften*, p. 15.

¹ Cf. an analogous classification with regard to the marriage law, of which Jacob b. Ephraim is the author, in my monograph on the latter, pp. vii, xviii (= *Kaufmann-Gedenkbuch*, pp. 175, 186).

P. 263, l. 14. In the commentary on Job xii. 7 (*Œuvres*, V, p. 40), besides this verse Ps. cxxxix. 8 is also given as an example of a figure of speech: ולו אמכן אן חסאל אלבהאים : לדלתך . . . הוּא תבאלנ פי אלבלאם . . . והוּא מחל קו' אם אסך שמים שם אחה אלך.

Ibid., l. 25. Instead of מא באלנין we should read (as Herr Mag. Israelson points out to me in a letter) מא באל ניסן.

P. 265, n. 1. This passage of Saadiah is, as can now be established, directed not against Jehuda ha-Parsi, but against the noted Karaite author of the ninth century, Benjamin al-Nahawendi. The latter had maintained that there are two kinds of month, lunar and solar (חרשי ירה and חרשי תקופות); and even found a proof for his position in Haggai i. 15 and ii. 1, where an event is dated in two ways, by the 24th Elul and the 21st Tishri. The difference of twenty-seven days is, he holds, to be referred to the difference between the lunar and solar months. Compare my remarks in *R. É. J.*, L, 19.

P. 268, n. 2. The article I promised here on Arabic expressions for the figure of hyperbole among Jewish authors appeared in *Z. f. H. B.*, III, 93 seq. Cf. also *ibid.*, p. 177, and the passage just cited from Saadiah's commentary on Job.

P. 275, l. 8. I published a rather long passage from this little anti-Karaite work on 'Anân in *R. É. J.*, XLV, 194 seq., and discussed it in detail. Cf. also Steinschneider, l. c., p. 342 *infra*, and my *Zur jüd.-arab. Litter.*, p. 86. Naturally the polemical campaign against the Karaites did not cease after Saadiah, but continued till the most recent times. I need only mention, e. g. (besides those named in my essay, pp. 274-5) in the Orient, Samuel ibn Jâmi' (see *R. É. J.*, l. c., 201), David b. Zimra (*Responsa*, No. 796), and Levi b. Ḥabib (see above, vol. XVIII, p. 219, n. 5); in Byzantium, Tobias b. Eliezer, author of לקח טוב (see Buber's *Preface*, § 14); in Spain, Judah ibn Bal'âm (*R. É. J.*, l. c., 193), Moses ibn Ezra (*ibid.*, 198), and Judah b. Barzilai (ספר העות), ed. *Mekize Nirdamim*, p. 25); in Germany and France,

Moses Taku (*R. É. J.*, l. c., 201), Zerahia ha-Levi (*Maor*, Sabbath, § 3 beginning), and Simson of Sens (see *R. É. J.*, VII, 41); in Italy, Aaron Abulrabi (in his commentary on Deut. xxv. 4; cf. *R. É. J.*, XXI, 253), &c. The polemics of these writers, however, are only of an incidental character; with the exception of the author of the anonymous little work just mentioned, none of them composed a special controversial treatise, unless we are to consider as such the work of a Turkish Rabbi of last century, Solomon Kimḥi, entitled מלאכת שלמה (printed 1862). The author here endeavoured to show that the Karaites are to be considered as beasts, that it is forbidden to instruct them in the Torah, and that it is permitted to kill them. These statements were so monstrous that every copy of the work that could be seized was consigned to the flames by order of the Haham Bashi, Yakir Geron, in Constantinople. See Franco, *Essai sur l'histoire des Israélites de l'Empire Ottoman* (Paris, 1897), pp. 171, 172, and *Jew. Encycl.*, s.v. (VII, 497).

S. P.